

**U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Roseburg District, Oregon**

Swiftwater 2004 Instream Restoration Projects

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District of the Bureau of Land Management has analyzed a proposal called the **Swiftwater 2004 Instream Restoration Projects**. In the proposed action, restoration of spawning and rearing habitat in North Fork Big Tom Folley Creek (T21S, R7W, Sections 35 and 26), Big Tom Folley Creek (T22 and 21S, R7W, Sections 2 and 36), and Susan Creek (T26S, R2W, Section 14; W.M.) for resident and anadromous salmonids, through the enhancement of existing habitat and creation of additional habitat in the Elk Creek and Middle North Umpqua Watersheds.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-04-08, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

- 1). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 3) or cultural resources (EA, page 5).
- 2). The actions anticipated under this analysis are covered under the *Formal consultation and written concurrence on FY 2003-2008 management activities (Ref.# 1-15-03-F-160)* with the US Fish & Wildlife Service which concluded (pg. 29) that the project would “. . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl, murrelet and bald eagle, and are not likely to adversely modify spotted owl or murrelet critical habitat . . .”.
- 3). The elements of this action are covered the NOAA-fisheries *Programmatic Biological and Conference Opinion* (Oct. 18, 2002). The Biological Opinion (BO) concluded that the project “. . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of . . . OC coho salmon or OC steelhead”. . .” In addition, the proposed activities were analyzed for, and determined to not adversely affect Essential Fisheries Habitat (EFH).

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS)* dated October 1994 and its associated *Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP)* dated June 2, 1995. This proposal is located on lands within the Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations. Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and the proposed action alternatives.

Finding of No Significant Impacts:

I have reviewed this Environmental Assessment for any potentially significant environmental impacts. The tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached) were applied. Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared

William O'Sullivan
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: No identified impacts are judged to be severe.
2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design criteria governing the proposal (EA, Appendix C), the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.
3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) do not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics ((EA, Appendix E).
4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: No controversial effects were noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.
5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.
6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The placement of logs and boulders in streams is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.
7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.
8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Remarks: The EA (Appendix E) does not indicate that this action would adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species	(√) Yes (see remarks)	() No
Botanical Species	() Yes	(√) No
Terrestrial Species	() Yes	(√) No

Remarks: Although this action would be considered to be a “may affect, likely to adversely affect” for a coho salmon; the actions anticipated under this analysis are covered under the *Programmatic Biological and Conference Opinion* (Oct. 18, 2002) consultation with NOAA - fisheries which concluded that the action “. . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of . . . OC coho salmon”. Therefore the impacts are not considered to be significant.

Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required.

This action is covered under the FWS *Formal consultation and written concurrence on FY 2003-2008 management actions* (February 21, 2003) which concluded that activity is “. . . not likely to adversely affect spotted owls and murrelets . . .”.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? () Yes (√) No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.